

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/934,906	08/22/2001	Joseph F. Kenney JR.	091395-9235 (4872-TC-AU)	8047	
75	11/08/2002				
John C. Bigler			EXAMINER		
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP Suite 360			GRAHAM, MATTHEW C		
3773 Corporate Center Valley, I			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Comer vancy,	1005		3683	<del></del>	
			DATE MAILED: 11/08/2002	DATE MAILED: 11/08/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	The second secon	
Office Action Summary	Application, No. 906 Applicantis TR  Examiner Art Unit  RAHAM 3483	
•	610.1111	
	s on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	
communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, I  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the	CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed ication.	
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This ac	ction is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under Ex p	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s)	is/are pending in the application.	
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration	
5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.	
67 Claim(s) 1 - 9 ANO 11- 19	is/are rejected.	
7) Claim(s) 10 4 15	is/are objected to.	
8) 🗆 Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	e objected to by the Evaminer	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/ar	is: a) □ approved b) □ disapproved.	
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	·	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some* c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents ha	ive been received.	
	eve been received in Application No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bur *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of t	documents have been received in this National Stage reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). The certified copies not received.	
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domesti		
·		
Attachment(s)		
15) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).	
15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  16) Notice of Dreftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	18) Interview Summary (P10-413) Paper No(s).  19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PT0-152)	

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pitner '956 in view of the disclosed prior art shown in Figures 1 and 2.

Pitner shows an axial thrust bearing having a retainer 713 and spring 711. The claimed invention differs only in the type of spring.

The disclosed prior art shows the use of Belleville spring washers to retain thrust bearings.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have utilized a spring washer in Pitner in view of the disclosed prior art as a mere substitute of known equivalent springs.

Re-claim 2, Pitner shows a case.

Re-claim 3-5, the case of Pitner forms a two-piece cup.

Re-claim 6, the use of a one-piece cup is shown in Fig. 6 of Pitner.

Re-claim 7, to have the aperture at the bottom of the cup of Pitner would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a mere reversal of location of parts.

Re-claims 8-9, the disclosed prior art shows Belleville springs.

Re-claim 11, Pitner shows rollers.

Re-claim 12, Pitner shows a box-type bearing cage.

Application/Control Number: 09/934,906

Art Unit: 3683

Re-claim 13, the use of a sigma-type cage would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art as a mere substitute of known equivalent parts.

Re-claim 14, the type of manufacturing method would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art as a well-known forming process that is not critical to the

claimed product.

Claims 10 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base 3.

claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to 4.

applicant's disclosure. Chiba and Tsuruki show thrust bearings.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mr. Graham at 5.

telephone number (703) 308-1113.

Graham/kl

October 17, 2002

MATTHEW C. GRAHAM **PRIMARY EXAMINER** 

Page 3

**GROUP 310**